DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 254 314 PS 014 884

AUTHOR Shepardson, Richard
TITLE An Analysis of Staff Development Activities Conducted in Iowa's Public Elementary Schools.
INSTITUTION Legislative Extended Assistance Group. Iowa City, IA.
SPONS AGENCY Northwest Area Foundation, St. Paul, Minn.
PUB DATE Jun 84
NOTE 72p.; Also funded by the Iowa General Assembly.
AVAILABLE FROM Legislative Extended Assistance Group, N222 OH, University of Iowa, Oakdale, IA 52319 ($6.00).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; Elementary Education; *Elementary School Teachers; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Professional Development; Questionnaires; *School Policy; *Staff Development; State Surveys; Teacher Administrator Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Iowa

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted (1) to ascertain types of staff development activities and procedures being used in public elementary schools in Iowa, and (2) to determine how these procedures compare with principles and guidelines supported by research. Data were collected from a total of 246 randomly selected teachers, principals, and superintendents. The present report is organized around six principles of effective staff development proposed by Gordon Lawrence (1974). Chapter 1 discusses the benefits of inservice education activities linked to a general effort of the school versus "single-shot" activities not part of a general staff development plan. Chapter 2 focuses on teacher involvement in adopting and implementing staff development activities. Activities that place teachers in an active rather than a passive role are discussed in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 elaborates the benefits of individualized inservice training experiences for teachers over common activities for all participants. Chapter 5 discusses inservice training programs that emphasize demonstrations, supervised trials, and feedback. It is argued that such programs are more likely to accomplish their goals than programs in which teachers are expected to store up ideas and behavioral prescriptions for future use. Finally, Chapter 6 discusses peer support during staff development. (AS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED254314

AN ANALYSIS OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED IN IOWA'S PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

by
Richard Shepardson

Project Assisted by

THE LEGISLATIVE EXTENDED ASSISTANCE GROUP

Funded by

The Iowa General Assembly

and

The Northwest Area Foundation
Grant No. 515851 to
The University of Iowa

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
John W. Fuller/
The Legislative
Extended Assistance
Group
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Report Published by

The Legislative Extended Assistance Group
The University of Iowa
Oakdale, Iowa 52319

June 1984

PS 014884

Richard Shepardson is a Professor in the College of Education at The University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

PREFACE

Iowa's Legislative Extended Assistance Group (LEAG) was formed in 1978 to encourage interaction between state government and university researchers.* Each year LEAG has identified issues of public policy where research is needed to aid Iowa's legislature. Specific proposals for research have been solicited, and LEAG has funded practical projects of policy research which have been undertaken by college and university faculty throughout Iowa. The results of the research work are given peer review prior to being published and made available to all members of the Iowa General Assembly. In addition, from time to time other research efforts are supported at the direction of the Legislative Council to assist the legislature in its activity.

This report, by Professor Richard Shepardson of The University of Iowa, was produced in support of the Education Task Force of the General Assembly. It deals with educational development activities in Iowa elementary schools. Dr. Shepardson collected survey information from some 100 elementary teachers, 130 elementary principals, and 115 superintendents about their perceptions of staff development efforts. The results suggest ways in which funds allocated to staff development can be spent more effectively. In particular, Dr. Shepardson recommends: producing more effective development programs, consistent with guidelines he puts forth, and; analyzing factors influencing or creating the less effective development activities now taking place with Iowa's smaller school districts. Shepardson believes the state of Iowa should exercise greater leadership through coordination, technical assistance, providing incentives, or regulating staff development to improve current practices.

The research performed for this and other LEAG reports has been supported by grants from the Northwest Area Foundation and the Iowa General Assembly. Copies of all LEAG reports are available through The University of Iowa, which administers the LEAG program.

John W. Fuller
LEAG Executive Director

*Prior to 1982, LEAG stood for Legislative Environmental Advisory Group. The revised title reflects the expanded scope of LEAG research activities for 1982 and subsequent years.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
LIST OF TABLES	ii
INTRODUCTION	iv
CHAPTER	
1. "Single-Shot Vs. Programmatic Staff Development Activities	1
2. Teacher Involvement in Adopting and Implementing Staff Development Activities	7
3. Staff Development Activities Which Place the Teacher in an Active Rather than Receptive Role	20
4. Individualized Vs. Common Staff Development Activities	25
5. Provisions for Experimentation and Feedback During Staff Development	30
6. Peer Support During Staff Development	43
SUMMARY	51
BIBLIOGRAPHY	58

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study could not have been conducted without the financial assistance and suggestions of a number of people. I would like to thank Margaret Borgen, Chairperson of the Teaching Quality Subcommittee, and the members of the subcommittee for their suggestions and support; Jan Sweeney, Diane Bolender, and Susan Lerdal of the Research Division of the Iowa Legislative Council for their logistical help; and, two graduate students, Sandra Renegar and Karen Lortz, for their input on the questionnaire design. A special thanks is extended to Peggy Shannon for typing the manuscript under a very tight time schedule. Also, I would like to thank Dr. William Matthes, Associate Dean of the College of Education, and Dr. John Fuller, Director of the Legislative Extended Assistance Group, for their support and financial assistance in the development and distribution of this paper.

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.1	A Comparison of Inservice Activities Linked to a General Staff Development Plan and Isolated "Single-Shot" Activities	3
1.2	"Single-Shot" vs. Programmatic Staff Development Activities in Iowa	5
2.1	Comparison of Staff Development Projects Which Were/Were Not Initiated by Teachers	11
2.2	Comparison of Emergent to Preplanned Staff Development Activities	11
2.3	Individual Teachers' Involvement in Drafting Staff Development Goals	13
2.4	Teacher Organizations' Involvement in Drafting Staff Development Goals	14
2.5	Principal's and Teacher's Perceptions of Teacher Involvement in Initiating and Organizing Staff Development Activities	15
2.6	Percentage of Building Funds Spent on Building Level Staff Development as Reported by Elementary Principals	17
3.1	Comparison of Staff Development Activities Which Place the Teacher in an Active Role as Compared to a Receptive Role	21
3.2	Percentage of Staff Development Activities Which Use a Presentation Format and Place the Elementary Teacher in a Receptive Role	23
4.1	Individualized Versus Common Staff Development Activities	26
4.2	Percentage of Building Funds Spent on Individual Teacher Staff Development as Reported by Elementary Principals	28
5.1	A Comparison of Programs Which Do/Do Not Provide Opportunities for Trial and Feedback	34

TABLE		PAGE
5.2	Frequency With Which Sample Units and Materials for Classroom Experimentation are Provided	35
5.3	Frequency With Which Written Theoretical Guidelines are Provided	36
5.4	Use of Live or Videotaped Demonstrations in Elementary Staff Development Activities	37
5.5	Use of Roleplaying and Microteaching in Staff Development	38
5.6	Frequency With Which Elementary Teachers Receive Classroom Embedded Feedback on Their Use of a New Skill	39
6.1	A Comparison of Projects Which Provide for Teacher Sharing Versus Working in Isolation	46
6.2	Structured Opportunities for Teachers to Share With Each Other and Provide Mutual Assistance	47
6.3	Providing Counsel to Help a Teacher Integrate an Innovation into Their Instructional Program	48

INTRODUCTION

Many teachers will say their staff development activities* leave much to be desired. Some will speak favorably of motivating speakers and interesting sessions, but many shake their head and complain of boring sessions and inappropriate topics. In the teacher's lounge you will hear talk of "insultants" rather than "consultants". The derisive label "dog and pony show" is often used to characterize the all too frequent "single-shot" inservice sessions. Sessions which may be entertaining and informative but do little to change behavior and result in few lasting changes in the way teachers address their educational responsibilities (Showers, 1981: 1).

Today, much is known about effective and ineffective procedures for adopting, implementing, and maintaining change efforts:

- Lawrence and several graduate students conducted a comprehensive review in 1974 (updated in 1981). They examined 6,000 reports on staff development activities, isolating 59 reports which had quantitative findings and could be analyzed using the meta analysis technique (Lawrence, et al., 1974).

---

*This report will use N.E.A.'s recommended terminology for "inservice" activities:

> Continuing education is activity undertaken by professional education personnel to add or to refine professional knowledge or skills. Staff development is usually mandatory, continuing education undertaken by a whole faculty or sub-units of it to improve school program. Professional development is voluntarily continuing education undertaken by individual professionals to improve themselves as individual professionals. (Sweeney, 1983: 2)

- Joyce and Showers have an annotated report of 200 staff development studies which they considered to be the best of those produced from 1945 to 1977 (Joyce and Showers, 1977).
- Fullan has written a comprehensive text entitled The Meaning of Educational Change summarizing much of the theory and research dealing with staff development efforts in the United States and Canada (Fullan, 1982).

Many other valuable resources are noted in the bibliography. Considerable work has been done and the knowledge base is substantial. As stated by Joyce:

> By no means does the array of available experience and research-based knowledge add up to a complete, tested paradigm either for building comprehensive staff development systems or for implementing short-term programs. It is, However, extremely important to use what is available . . . . (Joyce, 1980: 13)

With this information as a base, this study attempted to ascertain what types of staff development activities and procedures were being used in Iowa, and how do they compare to the principles and guidelines supported by research.

Due to limited funding, the scope of the study was narrowed to staff development procedures being used in Iowa's public elementary schools. Questionnaires were sent to the following:

- 200 teachers randomly selected from Iowa's elementary teachers (K-6) (108 were returned)
- 88 principals randomly selected from districts having less than three elementary principals (58 were returned)
- 40 principals (who also serve as superintendents) were randomly selected from districts having less than three elementary principals (31 were returned)
- 128 principals representing the total population of principals in districts having three to six elementary principals (67 were returned)

- 25 superintendents representing the total population of superintendents of Iowa's largest districts (over 3,000 students) (13 were returned)
- 100 superintendents randomly selected from districts having less than 3,000 students (69 were returned)

Several points of clarification are needed to better understand why the above populations were selected.

1. This study was conducted in conjunction with another study analyzing principal's self reported perceptions of their behaviors during the implementation phase of staff development activities. These patterns will be compared to effective support behaviors as documented by research. For purposes of the study analyzing principal's behaviors, questionnaires were sent to all 128 of the principals in districts having three to six elementary principals (districts large enough to provide peer support but small enough to probably lack the benefits of a full time staff development director).
2. The same number of principals (128) were randomly selected from Iowa's smallest districts (less than three elementary principals) to analyze whether district size is a factor in determining the type of staff development activities offered teachers.
3. Due to limited funds, the decision was made to sample teacher perceptions rather than analyze perceptions of principals from Iowa's largest school districts. This decision was based on the desire to get a rough check on the degree of agreement between principal and teacher perceptions of staff development activities.

The poor return rates (apprximately 50 to 75 percent) can partially be explained by the fact we were operating on a tight time schedule, a

number of forms have been received after the cut-off data and were not analyzed in this report. Also, the questionnaires were sent out in late April and early May, a very hectic time for most school personnel.

For purposes of organization, and as a point of comparison, this report is organized around six principles of effective staff development. These principles were first presented in 1974, by Dr. Gordon Lawrence (College of Education, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32601) and several graduate students in the report: Patterns of Effective Inservice Education: A State of the Art Summary of Research on Materials and Procedures for Changing Teacher Behaviors in Inservice Education. The results from Dr. Lawrence's 1974 meta analysis are also presented in this report to give the reader a clearer perception of the research base supporting each of the six staff development principles. It is hoped this information will prove useful to those interested in improving the effectiveness of today's schools.

R.D. Shepardson

CHAPTER 1

"SINGLE-SHOT" VERSUS PROGRAMMATIC STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Principle 1. Teachers are more likely to benefit from inservice education activities that are linked to a general effort of the school than they are from "single-shot" programs that are not part of a general staff development plan.

Introduction

"Single-shot" inservice sessions serve a function in staff development. Most "single-shot" sessions are one or two hour lecture presentations. These sessions are economical ways to acquaint or introduce teachers to new ideas and, thus, serve a necessary function. As noted in P.D.K.'s newsletter, "Practical Applications of Research":

> One-day "one-shot" inservices are in great demand. If the goal of these sessions is to boost morale, broaden awareness of choices for other sessions, or provide an overview of a program policy, the one-time-only model can be successful. And if one judges success by demand, one-time-only sessions again appear to be quite successful, for there are far more demands for this type of session than for any other. (Callen, et al., 1983: 1)

Teachers are isolated from new ideas. They do not readily have the opportunity to attend conferences, workshops, and institutes. Their time and access to professional newsletters, journals, and texts are limited.

Administrators and A.E.A. personnel have more opportunities to be exposed to new ideas and techniques. This differential exposure to ideas which creates an awareness problem for teachers has been summarized by House (1974: Ch. 1). The resulting lack of teacher influence during the selection and adoption phase of innovative programs has been comprehensively analyzed by Fullan (1982: Ch. 4). To quote Fullan:

> Teachers are much less likely to come into contact with new ideas, for they are restricted to the classroom and have a

> limited network of professionally based interaction within their schools or with their professional peers outside. (Fullan, 1982: 44)

Fullan footnotes this comment stating:

> . . . I am not implying that all members of a group function the same way. There are many individuals who are exceptions, but the sociological pressure is otherwise and eventually exerts its influence on the majority of people in the role. (Fullan, 1982: 44)

"Single-shot" inservice sessions can help keep teachers up to date. Because they serve this important function does not mean they should be the only or the main format used. "Single-shot" sessions are usually "canned" presentations. They are prepared in advance by the consultant or "expert" with limited knowledge of the participants' specific situations or needs. The session is usually an audience situation with little give-and-take between presenter and participants. This is efficient when the objective is information presentation but not recommended for skill development or other complex learning.

Taking ideas presented in such "single-shot" inservice sessions and putting them into practice is a complex and difficult translation. It takes a dedicated teacher with time to pursue the ideas through reading, consultation, and/or curriculum and materials development. To make this translation, teachers must also be skilled in self analysis as they make initial attempts to adapt and employ innovations. It is surprising how many teachers are able to effectively make this translation; however, as concluded by McKibben, "Enormous differences exist in the extent to which teachers pull growth-producing experiences from their environment and exploit personal and professional activities" (McKibben, 1982: 36).

The importance of programmatic staff development was concisely summarized in the 1981 A.S.C.D. Yearbook:

> Significant improvement in educational practice takes considerable time and is the result of systematic, long-range staff development. Educators constantly look for instant success, immediate improvements in professional performance and student achievement. However, inservice is effective when short term workshops, classroom supervision, and other staff development activities are viewed as part of a larger effort to achieve a significant change in current practice. Instant changes in professional behavior are unlikely to be significant; seldom are they lasting. (Wood, Thompson, and Russell, 1981: 60).

Research Review

Table 1.1 summarizes research dealing with the effectiveness of "single-shot" and programmatic staff development activities. The review sponsored by the Florida Educational Research and Development Program located 97 data based evaluations of staff development programs. Of these, 18 were linked to a programmatic effort and 79 were "single-shot" sessions.

TABLE 1.1
A COMPARISON OF INSERVICE ACTIVITIES LINKED TO A GENERAL STAFF DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND ISOLATED "SINGLE-SHOT" ACTIVITIES

	Programmatic (N=18)	Single-Shot (N=79)
Significant Positive Change	94%	68%
No Significant Difference	0%	22%
Mixed	6%	10%

Source: Patterns of Effective Inservice Education: A State of the Art Summary of Research on Materials and Procedures for Changing Teacher Behaviors in Inservice Education, Florida Department of Education, Division of Elementary and Secondary Education, Florida Educational Research and Development Program, 1974: 16.

Ninety-four percent of the staff development activities linked to a general staff development effort produced a significant positive change; whereas, only 68 percent of the "single-shot" efforts did. Twenty-two percent of the "single-shot" projects showed no significant difference and 10 percent reported mixed results.

Emrich and Peterson analyzed five large federally-funded programs involving the use of outside consultants. One of the conclusions drawn from their findings relates to the need for ongoing contact between consultants and teachers: ". . . external agents have to have some continuous contact with school district people if they are to have an impact" (Fullan, 1982: 185).

Survey of Practices in Iowa

The "single-shot" inservice session is the mainstay of staff development activities in Iowa. Table 1.2 shows that 47 percent of the elementary teachers surveyed in Iowa indicated "almost all" of their staff development activities were "single-shot" programs. As might be expected, administrators report less reliance on "single-shot" sessions.

Figure 1
SINGLE SHOT VS. PROGRAMMATIC
STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES IN IOWA
QUESTION USED ON SURVEY INSTRUMENT

What percent of staff development activities for your teachers are "single-shot" programs as compared to being part of an extended staff development program?

____ Almost all
____ Over half
____ Less than half
____ A very small percentage
____ None

TABLE 1.2
"SINGLE-SHOT" VS. PROGRAMMATIC
STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES IN IOWA

SAMPLE	N	Almost All	Over Half	Less Than Half	A Very Small Percentage	None
Superintendents						
Over 3,000 Students	16	6%	19%	50%	19%	0%
Less than 3,000 Students	69	26%	36%	20%	14%	0%
Supt/Prin (Small District)	31	29%	32%	19%	19%	-
Principals						
3-6 Elem. Prin/District	67	30%	27%	25%	18%	-
1-2 Elem. Prin/District	58	40%	36%	14%	10%	-
Elementary Teachers	63	47%	17%	15%	13%	3%

The data in Table 1.2 indicates smaller districts are more likely to use "single-shot" programs. To illustrate, if the two categories "almost all" and "over half" are combined, the range in the percent of administrators reporting heavy reliance on "single-shot" sessions is from 25 percent (superintendents from districts with over 3,000 students) to 76 percent (principals from districts with only 1 or 2 elementary principals).

This phenomena is not unexpected. There are similar findings noted in the literature. Fullan (1982, p. 44) states:

> Finally, access to innovations, as is obvious but rarely emphasized, depends on an infrastructure of communication--ease of transportation, resources, and density of population and ideas in the geographical area. Urban school districts and large-size school districts enjoy favorable conditions; rural and small-size school districts do not.

Important Facts

1. Forty-eight percent of the elementary teachers sampled in Iowa report "almost all" their staff development activities are "single-shot" inservice sessions.
2. Size of district in Iowa is related to the frequency with which administrators report heavy reliance on "single-shot" staff development activities.
3. More frequent use of "single-shot" staff development activities is reported by administrators from smaller districts in Iowa.

Discussion

It appears too many staff development efforts experienced by Iowa's elementary teachers are "single-shot" activities. The problem becomes worse as district size gets smaller. This over-reliance on "single-shot" sessions should be analyzed in more depth to see what obstacles or roadblocks are helping create the situation. What factors are operating in Iowa's smaller districts to cause the heavier reliance on "single-shot" staff development activities? Is this heavier reliance detracting from the educational opportunities being provided Iowa's rural elementary students? Are A.E.A.'s helping alleviate the problem or are they encouraging the use of "single-shot" sessions?

It would appear the State could realize a better return on its current expenditures for staff development if a greater variety and better balance of staff development activities were used.

"Single-shot" sessions serve motivational and informational purposes, but they fall far short of the mark when it comes to changing teacher behavior and improving teacher effectiveness.

CHAPTER 2

TEACHER INVOLVEMENT IN ADOPTING AND IMPLEMENTING STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Principle 2. It should be clear to teachers that their needs and concerns are the basis for decisions made during both the adoption and implementation phases of staff development.

Introduction

As with most educational issues, the role of teacher involvement during adoption and implementation of staff development projects is a complex issue. Most agree teachers should play a significant role in determining the goals and processes to be used in their own staff development activities; however, a number of constraints currently limit teacher contributions.

The problem teachers have with lack of access to new ideas has already been discussed. A second constraint to teacher participation is lack of time and the on-going pressures experienced by teachers as they try to meet their daily classroom responsibilities. Many teachers are reluctant to give time to planning and designing staff development activities because they are too busy with other responsibilities and feel overworked (Glatthorn, 1984: 6).

A third constraint relates to perspective. Teachers usually see things in terms of their needs in their own classroom and are less likely to advocate district-wide reforms (Fullan, 1982: 46).

The lack of access to new ideas, limited time and energy, and individualistic orientation to problems and concerns are natural obstacles to teacher involvement during both the initial planning and implementation phases of staff development. Nevertheless, teacher ownership of staff development projects is critical. To quote Fullan, "Educational change depends on what teachers do and think--it's as simple and as complex as that" (Fullan, 1982: 107). Teachers must perceive the staff development project as needed.

Wood, Thompson, and Russell posit the following guideline:

> Professional growth requires personal and group commitment to new performance norms. Changes in professional practice start with a desire to behave differently. Adults, to a great extent, make their own decisions about what they will and will not learn; they are the "gatekeepers" for what will be learned. Educators are much more likely to be open to new learning when they and their peers have cooperatively developed a commitment to changes in their behavior. (Wood, Thompson, and Russell, 1981: 62)

Rubin stressed the same point:

> The teacher is not a helpless learner, and his own perception of what will enable him to funcion more effectively may serve as our most intelligent point of departure. Apart from its psychological validity, such an approach will circumvent the individual's resistance to external direction, and it will make him an active rather than a passive participant in the shaping of his own growth. (Dumais, et al., 1982: 3-4)

It follows that the more involved teachers are in staff development decisions the greater the guarantee they will collectively support the project. But, this is an oversimplification. Fullan cautions that change is a very personal phenomena. Just because some teachers are involved in the planning stages is no guarantee all teachers involved will individually value and understand the rationale and goals of a project.

> Whether the teacher is the main advocate or part of a development/decision-making committee, the way in which fellow teachers are approached is crucial. Too often teachers on curriculum development teams fail to recognize that they have benefited from a process of learning which others have not experienced. If these teachers try to see the product without recognizing that it may not be the most important thing on other teachers' minds, and without being sensitive to the need for other teachers to come to grips with the sense of the innovation (and to modify in some ways the cherished ideas of the developers), they will be doing exactly what most developers or advocates of change do--confuse the change with the change process. (Fullan, 1982: 124-125)

Thus, there are natural roadblocks within the system that work against teacher involvement in planning and implementing staff development projects.

But, teacher perceptions are critical to success. Teachers must perceive their needs and concerns are being considered both in the adoption and implementation phases of staff development projects. This principle is supported by a comprehensive study of over 5,000 teachers, teacher educators, and community members in California, Michigan, and Georgia (Yarger, Howey, and Joyce, 1979). This study resulted in several recommendations directly related to the role of teachers in planning and implementing staff development activities.

> 1. Inservice decisions should be made by a collaborative governance body rather than by the local school district administration.
> 2. Teachers should play the important role in collaborative governance structures that are developed.
> 3. There are pitfalls and problems in developing and sustaining an effective, collaborative governance structure. These include--(1) lack of skill in cooperative decision-making, (2) vested interests inhibit open communication, (3) lack of a conceptual framework to organize parties effectively, (4) lack of financial support, and (5) participants too busy with other priorities.
> 4. States should not set guidelines or standards for the amount or type of inservice. Teachers and local school districts should play the most important role in establishing specific standards.
>
> (Yarger, Howey, and Joyce, 1979: 39)

Mangieri and Kemper provide a set of eight guidelines for insuring adequate teacher involvement in, and satisfaction with, inservice programs.

> 1. The committee or task force responsible for planning an inservice program should include adequate teacher representation. Ideally, teachers will be selected on the basis of their skill, experience, and enthusiasm for the task. Always, they should be selected by their teaching peers.
> 2. Teachers should not feel that the inservice program is in any way punitive, or scheduled because they are perceived to be incompetent. Rather, the program should be promoted as an effort to improve the overall effectiveness of the educational system, and an attempt to develop teachers' professional competence and status.

3. Inservice programs should be models of the same high quality educational practices that teachers are expected to provide for their students. Experiences should be individualized on the basis of differences in teachers' experience, expertise, motivation, and specific needs.
4. When, where, and for how long an inservice program is conducted is important to teachers. While it is probably impossible to meet every teachers' ideal meeting time, place, and direction, it is not impossible to develop an inservice schedule that includes different meeting sites and times; is planned and published far enough in advance for teachers to make necessary adjustments in their schedules; and begins and ends according to a published schedule.
5. Inservice programs should be designed around the stated goals and objectives of the school district as well as the specific instructional goals and objectives of participating teachers. Teachers should be made aware in advance of the purpose(s) of the inservice program, and should understand how the program's purpose fits into both the general and specific goals and objectives of the school district's curriculum.
6. Teachers should be instrumental in determining the purpose of the inservice program; its content and staffing plan; and the nature, purpose, and use of evaluation efforts.
7. Follow-up is a key factor in a successful inservice program. If teachers are expected to implement in the classroom ideas presented in an inservice program, they must be made aware of resources for assistance in doing so. Teachers must also be assured that they will not receive unfavorable ratings while attempting to implement ideas presented in an inservice program.
8. The inservice program must include a positive reward system. If the reward for participating in an inservice program is more paperwork, longer working hours, or complex or impossible classroom management problems, the inservice effort will probably be in vain. If, on the other hand, this reward is interesting work, better results, or novelty teachers are more likely to adopt suggestions presented in the inservice program.

(Mangieri and Kemper, 1983: 27-28)

Research Review

Table 2.1 presents the findings of the Florida D.P.I. review of programs which were and those which were not initiated by teachers.

Although the number of projects reviewed which were initiated by teachers is small, it should be noted all three produced significant positive results. The conclusion drawn from the Florida analysis reads:

TABLE 2.1
COMPARISON OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS
WHICH WERE/WERE NOT INITIATED BY TEACHERS

	Self-Initiated (N=3)	Other Initiated (N=94)
Significant Positive Change	100%	72%
No Significant Difference	0%	18%
Mixed	0%	10%

(Source: Lawrence, G.D. "Patterns of Effective Inservice Education: A State of the Art Summary of Research on Materials and Procedures for Changing Teacher Behaviors in Inservice Education." Florida Educational Research and Development Program, Florida Department of Education, 1974: 16.)

"Self-initiated and self-directed training activities are seldom used in inservice education programs, but this pattern is associated with successful accomplishment of program goals" (Lawrence, 1974: 15).

Table 2.2 demonstrates the effectiveness of teacher involvement in the implementation phase of staff development projects. If, as a project develops,

TABLE 2.2
COMPARISON OF EMERGENT TO PREPLANNED
STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

	Emergent Design (N=21)	Preplanned (N=76)
Significant Positive Change	95%	67%
No Significant Difference	5%	21%
Mixed	0%	10%

(Source: Lawrence, G.D. "Patterns of Effective Inservice Education: A State of the Art Summary of Research on Materials and Procedures for Changing Teacher Behaviors in Inservice Education." Florida Educational Research and Development Program, Florida Department of Education, 1974: 16.)

teachers have some say as to the direction the project takes and the scope and type of activities used, past efforts indicate these emergent projects will be more successful than preplanned projects. Again, it is important to have teacher input during both adoption and implementation.

The conclusion drawn from the review of projects summarized in Table 2.2 by the Florida research team was: "Teachers are more likely to benefit from inservice programs in which they can choose goals and activities for themselves, as contrasted with programs in which the goals and activities are preplanned" (Lawrence, 1974: 15).

Survey of Practices in Iowa

In the survey of practices in Iowa, several questions were asked relative to teacher involvement in governance and planning of staff development activities. The question asked of superintendents is presented in Figure 2.

As shown in Table 2.3, about half the superintendents (65 percent in the larger districts) reported teachers have "some" involvement in drafting staff development goals. About one-third (41 percent in the smaller districts) of the superintendents reported teachers had "considerable" involvement in drafting the goals and less than 10 percent reported teachers had "no responsibility" in drafting the goals.

As shown in Table 2.4, over 40 percent of the superintendents reported that teacher organizations (unions) have some responsibility in drafting staff development goals and over 20 percent reported the teachers' unions had "considerable" responsibility.

A parallel item was used in the questionnaire sent to superintendents related to teacher involvement in designing and implementing staff development

Figure 2
TEACHER INVOLVEMENT IN DRAFTING
STAFF DEVELOPMENT GOALS
QUESTION USED ON SURVEY INSTRUMENT

How involved are the following in drafting staff development goals for teachers in your district? (Circle the appropriate number)

	Degree of Involvement in Setting Staff Development Goals			
	No Responsibility	Some	Considerable	Full Responsibility
Superintendent.....	1	2	3	4
Management Council (Administrators and Central Office Staff)...	1	2	3	4
Individual principals....	1	2	3	4
Teacher's professional organization (union)....	1	2	3	4
Individual teachers.....	1	2	3	4
Area Education Association.....	1	2	3	4
Department of Public Instruction.....	1	2	3	4
Local Board of Education.	1	2	3	4
Parents (community).....	1	2	3	4
Private consultants.....	1	2	3	4
Publishers.....	1	2	3	4
Other (please list).....	1	2	3	4

TABLE 2.3
INDIVIDUAL TEACHERS' INVOLVEMENT IN DRAFTING
STAFF DEVELOPMENT GOALS

	N	No Responsibility	Some	Considerable	Full Responsibility
Supt. over 3,000 students	14	6%	65%	28%	--
Supt. less than 3,000 students	64	8%	50%	41%	1%

TABLE 2.4
TEACHER ORGANIZATIONS' INVOLVEMENT IN
DRAFTING STAFF DEVELOPMENT GOALS

	N	No Responsibility	Some	Considerable	Full Responsibility
Supt. over 3,000 students	13	31%	46%	23%	--
Supt. less than 3,000 students	61	34%	41%	25%	--

activities. The results were basically the same for designing and implementing as they were for drafting the goals. In this case, no effort was made to ascertain whether elementary and secondary teachers have equal input.

When elementary teachers were asked how often teachers in their school initiated and organized staff development activities, 18 percent responded "never" and 33 percent "seldom". Table 2.5 reports this data along with principal responses to the same question.

Figure 3
PRINCIPAL'S AND TEACHER'S PERCEPTIONS
OF TEACHER INVOLVEMENT IN INITIATING AND
ORGANIZING STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES
QUESTION USED ON SURVEY INSTRUMENT

How often do teachers in your school initiate and organize staff development activities?

____ Almost always
____ Regularly
____ Sometimes
____ Seldom
____ Never

TABLE 2.5
PRINCIPAL'S AND TEACHER'S PERCEPTIONS
OF TEACHER INVOLVEMENT IN INITIATING AND
ORGANIZING STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

	N	Almost Always	Regularly	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
Prin. 3-6/dist.	67	3%	15%	44%	28%	10%
Prin. 1-2/dist.	57	--	4%	46%	42%	8%
Teachers	97	4%	7%	37%	33%	19%

In general, principals indicated teachers carry more responsibility. This was particularly true in the smaller districts having only 1 to 2 elementary principals in the district. Note in Table 2.5 under the column headed "Regularly", 7 percent of the elementary teachers said they regularly initiated and organized staff development activities in their schools; whereas, 15 percent of the principals in larger districts and only 4 percent of the principals in smaller districts responded that teachers "regularly" were involved.

One can conclude from the data presented in Table 2.5 that elementary teachers do not perceive they are regularly involved in initiating and organizing staff development activities. Principals report teachers are more heavily involved, but less than 5 percent of the principals report teachers are "almost always" involved. District size is a factor with teachers in smaller districts seemingly less involved in initiating and organizing staff development activities.

Another aspect of governance is the allocation of funds. As quoted by Wood, Thompson, and Russell:

> The school is the primary unit of change; not the district or the individual (Goodlad, 1975). Given the size of school districts that serve most students in the United States, it is doubtful whether significant change in practice can be implemented across an entire system (Berman and McLaughlin, 1978). The individual teacher, on the other hand, is too small a unit and too isolated a target for change. (Wood, Thompson, and Russell, 1981: 62)

Stallings reported "staff development makes the most difference in teacher behavior change and student achievement when the program is schoolwide" (Stallings, 1981: 18).

Two conclusions based on Lawrence's 1974 review, which was updated in 1981, relate to the principle of making the school the unit of change. They are:

> 1. The inservice programs most successful in accomplishing their objectives were ones that were designed as a collective effort of a faculty, with common purposes directed toward general faculty development rather than the separate goals and needs of individual faculty members.
> 2. The inservice programs most successful in accomplishing their objectives were ones that were funded in ways that permitted the teachers and administrators of individual schools to sponsor them, to design activities, and to select inside and outside leadership as appropriate to their plans.
>
> (Callen, et al., 1983: 2)

In Iowa, over 30 percent of the elementary principals report "a very small percentage" of their district's staff development funds are spent on building level staff development as compared to district or individual staff development.

Slightly over 10 percent of the elementary principals reported that "over half" of the funds were spent for building level staff development, and less than 10 percent said "almost all" funds were spent at the building level.

Figure 4
PERCENTAGE OF BUILDING FUNDS SPENT ON
BUILDING LEVEL STAFF DEVELOPMENT AS REPORTED
BY ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS
QUESTION USED ON SURVEY INSTRUMENT

What percent of your district's staff development funds are spent on building level staff development as compared to district level or individual staff development?

____ Almost all
____ Over half
____ Less than half
____ A very small percentage
____ None
____ No funds are allocated to my building for staff development

TABLE 2.6
PERCENTAGE OF BUILDING FUNDS SPENT ON
BUILDING LEVEL STAFF DEVELOPMENT AS REPORTED
BY ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS

	N	Almost All	Over Half	Less than Half	A Very Small Percentage	None
Prin. 3-6/dist.	64	6%	11%	23%	33%	27%
Prin. 1-2/dist.	57	9%	12%	25%	42%	12%

With approximately 50 percent of the principals reporting that "none" or "a very small percentage" of the staff development funds are spent at the building level, serious questions are raised as to whether current funding patterns within districts facilitate maximum benefit from staff development dollars.

Important Facts

1. Only 28 percent of the superintendents from large districts (over 3,000 students) in Iowa report that teachers have considerable

responsibility in drafting staff development goals. Seven percent (7%) of these superintendents report teachers have "no responsibility".

2. Forty-one percent (41%) of the superintendents of smaller districts (less than 3,000 students) report teachers have considerable responsibility in drafting staff development goals. Only 8 percent report teachers have "no responsibility".
3. Approximately 25 percent of the superintendents in both large and small districts in Iowa report that teacher organizations (unions) have considerable responsibility in drafting staff development goals. A slightly larger percentage (31% and 34%) report teacher organizations have "no responsibility".
4. Responses from elementary teachers indicate they perceive their responsibility as being much less. Nineteen percent (19%) say they "never" initiate and organize staff development activities and 33 percent say they "seldom" do. Only 7 percent say they "regularly" do and 4 percent say they "almost always" are involved in initiating and planning staff development activities.
5. Ten percent (10%) of the principals in larger districts say teachers "never" initiate and plan staff development activities, and 28 percent say teachers are "seldom" involved. Only 3 percent say teachers are "almost always" involved and 15 percent say teachers are "regularly" involved.
6. Principals in smaller districts report less teacher involvement. Eight percent (8%) of these principals reported teachers were

"never" involved and 42 percent said the teachers were "seldom" involved. Forty-six percent (46%) said teachers were regularly involved.

7. Less than 10 percent of the elementary principals in Iowa reported that "almost all" their district's staff development funds are spent on building level staff development. A little over 10 percent said "over half" their funds were spent on building programs. About 25 percent said "less than half" and approximately 35 percent said "a very small percentage" was spent on building level projects.

Discussion

It would appear a greater percentage of staff development funds should be allocated to building level projects in Iowa's elementary schools. It also seems evident that elementary teachers in Iowa need greater involvement in designing, adopting, and implementing staff development projects. How this involvement can be achieved is a complex problem. Simple placement of teachers on advisory or planning boards is not a satisfactory answer. What is needed are more emerging staff development projects conducted at the building level as compared to "canned" or preplanned district or A.E.A. projects.

CHAPTER 3

STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES WHICH PLACE THE TEACHER IN AN ACTIVE RATHER THAN RECEPTIVE ROLE

Principal 3. Inservice education programs that place the teacher in an active role (constructing and generating materials, ideas, and behaviors) are more likely to accomplish their objectives than are programs that place the teacher in a receptive role (accepting ideas and behavior prescriptions not of his or her own making).

Introduction

To be effective, staff development activities should have active learning components consistent with fundamental principles of effective teaching and learning (such as field-based instruction, demonstrations, practice of skills and feedback) (Dumais, et al., 1982: 13). The traditional lecture format should not be the mainstay of staff development projects.

Heavy reliance on lectures does not respect the special learning characteristics of teachers. Teachers are adult learners and, as such, are independent and assertive. A helpful list of suggestions for staff development projects based on the special characteristics of adult learners is presented in the monograph, Investigating Inservice.

> Woods and Thompson (1980) outline a list of descriptors of adult learners which they suggest are critical in inservice planning. Based upon their list of eleven descriptors, they suggest that effective inservice programs must:
>
> 1. Include more participant control of the "what" and "how" of learning;
> 2. Focus on job related tasks that the participants consider real and important;
> 3. Provide choices and alternatives that accommodate the differences among participants;
> 4. Include opportunities for participants in inservice training to practice what they are to learn in simulated and real work settings as part of their training;

5. Encourage the learners to work in small groups and to learn from each other; and
6. Reduce the use and threat of external judgments from one's superior by allowing peer-participants to give each other feedback concerning performance and areas of needed improvement.

(Dumais, et al., 1982: 9)

Many inservice sessions use an audience type format placing the teacher in a receptive role. As with the "single-shot" sessions, there is an appropriate time for the audience format, but it should not be all the time or most of the time.

Research Review

Inservice programs judged most successful in accomplishing their objectives were ones that "involved participants in both receptive and active roles--receiving new ideas and putting them into action--rather than one type without the other" and ones that "did not rely on lecture presentations as the main strategy" (Callen, et al., 1983: 2).

TABLE 3.1
COMPARISON OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES
WHICH PLACE THE TEACHER IN AN ACTIVE ROLE
AS COMPARED TO A RECEPTIVE ROLE

	Active Role (N=66)	Receptive Role (N=31)
Significant Positive Change	83%	51%
No Significant Difference	12%	29%
Mixed	5%	20%

(Source: Lawrence, G.D. "Patterns of Effective Inservice Education: A State of the Art Summary of Research on Materials and Procedures for Changing Teacher Behaviors in Inservice Education." Florida Educational Research and Development Program, Florida Department of Education, 1974: 16.)

The superiority of staff development projects which place the teacher in an active role and do not rely solely on an audience or lecture type format is presented in Table 3.1.

The percentages in Table 3.1 underscore the futility of relying on audience presentations. This is convincing data, consistent with good learning theory.

Survey of Practices in Iowa

Approximately 16 percent of the elementary principals sampled reported teachers "almost always" are exposed to staff development activities that place teachers in a receptive role. Another 44 percent said this happens "over half the time". Thirty-nine percent (39%) of the teachers said they "almost always" are placed in a receptive role. Another 34 percent said it happens "over half the time".

Figure 3
PERCENTAGE OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES
WHICH USE A PRESENTATION FORMAT AND PLACE THE
ELEMENTARY TEACHER IN A RECEPTIVE ROLE
QUESTION USED ON SURVEY INSTRUMENT

How often are you exposed to staff development activities which use a presentation format and place you in a basically receptive role?

____ Almost always
____ Over half the time
____ Less than half the time
____ Seldom
____ Never

TABLE 3.2
PERCENTAGE OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES
WHICH USE A PRESENTATION FORMAT AND PLACE THE
ELEMENTARY TEACHER IN A RECEPTIVE ROLE

SAMPLE	N	Almost Always	Over Half the Time	Less Than Half the Time	Seldom	Never
Prin. 3-6/dist.	67	16%	44%	21%	19%	--
Prin. 1-2 dist.	58	17%	45%	28%	10%	--
Teachers	95	39%	35%	21%	3%	2%

Discussion

It is heartening to note roughly 25 percent of the elementary teachers and a total of 40 percent of the elementary principals report less than half the teachers' staff development time is spent in audience situations. However, given the proven ineffectiveness of heavy reliance on lectures, serious concern has to be raised when 39 percent of the teachers report "almost all" their staff development activities are of this type.

There is considerable discrepancy between the administrators' and teachers' responses. Possibly the principals are influenced by their perceptions of "what should be" and the teachers may be restricting their definition of staff development to only inservice sessions. Nevertheless, questions have to be raised:

- In those cases where almost all the activities are audience situations, what conditions and factors contribute to the heavy reliance on the lecture format?
- In those cases where the lecture format is "seldom" used or used "less than half the time", is this by design or merely a matter of circumstances?

- When teachers and principals report that audience situations are not being used, what other types of staff development activities are being used? Are the different activities appropriate for the given staff development objectives.

CHAPTER 4

INDIVIDUALIZED VS. COMMON STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Principal 4. Inservice education programs that have differentiated training experiences for different teachers (that is, "individualized") are more likely to accomplish their objectives than are programs that have common activities for all participants.

Introduction

Change is a process and not an event. It occurs over time and can be discussed in terms of stages. In the 1981 ASCD Yearbook, Wood, Thompson, and Russell speak of five different project stages: (1) Readiness, (2) Planning, (3) Training, (4) Implementation, and (5) Maintenance (Wood, Thomson, and Russell, 1981: 64-87). Hall has described eight qualitatively different levels of use through which individual teachers may progress as they learn to use a new skill or innovation (Hall, 1975). The different project stages and the individual teacher's different levels of use call for different types of staff development interventions.

Individualization should not be defined as individual teachers pursuing their own interests and working in isolation; rather, individualized activities and goals should be tied to institutional goals (Dumais, et al., 1982: 8). Just as in teaching, individualization should not be interpreted to mean one-on-one teaching; instead, it should mean making allowances and using differential treatments to adjust for an individual's unique learning style, rate of growth, prior experience, etc.

Fullan summarizes much of the related research and builds a thorough case for differentiated training in staff development projects. The

following quote from Fullan's text, The Meaning of Educational Change, discusses the complexity of staff development:

> First, change is multidimensional and can vary accordingly within the same person as well as within groups. Second, there are some deep changes at stake, once we realize that people's basic conceptions of education and skills are involved--that is, their occupational identity, their sense of competence, and their self-concept. The need and difficulty for individuals to develop a sense of meaning about change is manifest. Third, compounding the second lesson is the fact that change consists of the three dimensions of change. Beliefs guide and are informed by teaching strategies and activities; the effective use of materials depends on their articulation with beliefs and teaching approaches; and so on. Many innovations entail changes in some aspects of educational beliefs, teaching behavior, use of new materials, and more. (Fullan, 1982: 33)

Staff development should be viewed as a multi-dimensional process requiring a variety of interventions according to the project's stage of development and the teacher's level of concern and level of use.

Research Review

Table 4.1 summarizes Lawrence's review of studies showing the effectiveness of those projects which were individualized and those which provided common activities for all staff.

TABLE 4.1
INDIVIDUALIZED VERSUS COMMON STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

	Individualized (N=43)	Common Activities (N=54)
Significant Positive Change	80%	68%
No Significant Difference	10%	24%
Mixed	10%	8%

(Source: Lawrence, G.D. "Patterns of Effective Inservice Education: A State of the Art Summary of Research on Materials and Procedures for Changing Teacher Behaviors in Inservice Education." Florida Educational Research and Development Program, Florida Department of Education, 1974: 16.)

A 1983 review of effective inservice which was in good part based on the above data, concluded:

> The inservice projects most successful in accomplishing their objectives were ones that had diverse program patterns that seemed to emphasize teacher responsibility--self-instruction, peer study groups, college courses, one-to-one consultation. (The formats loosely labeled as workshop and staff meeting were considerably less successful in achieving objectives.) (Callen, et al., 1983: 2)

The percentages in Table 4.1 demonstrate the superiority of staff development projects which make some provision for individualizing activities and procedures used.

Survey of Practices in Iowa

The degree of individualization of staff development activities offered Iowa's elementary teachers is reflected in whether they experience a variety of activities (see Chapters 1 and 2); whether they are given a chance to experiment with new techniques and skills and receive feedback on their attempts (see Chapter 5); and, whether funds are allocated to individual teachers to permit them to pursue their own individually tailored staff development program.

In terms of funding, elementary principals were asked what percent of their building staff development funds are spent on individual staff development (see Figure 4).

There was considerable spread in the responses (see Table 4.2). About one-third of the elementary principals said "a very small percentage" was spent on individual teachers.

In those cases where principals reported allocating "over half" or "almost all" of their funds to individual teachers, there was a significant difference according to district size. Principals from smaller districts reported allocating a greater percentage to individual teachers.

Figure 4
PERCENTAGE OF BUILDING FUNDS SPENT ON
INDIVIDUAL TEACHER STAFF DEVELOPMENT
AS REPORTED BY ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS
QUESTION USED ON SURVEY INSTRUMENT

What percent of your building's staff development funds are spent on individual staff development (i.e., hiring a substitute to free a teacher to attend a conference, observe another school, etc.)?

____ Almost all
____ Over half
____ Less than half
____ A very small percentage
____ None
____ No funds are allocated to my building for staff development

TABLE 4.2
PERCENTAGE OF BUILDING FUNDS SPENT ON
INDIVIDUAL TEACHER STAFF DEVELOPMENT
AS REPORTED BY ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS

	N	Almost All	Over Half	Less than Half	A Very Small Percentage	None
Prin. 3-6/dist.	53	4%	16%	21%	37%	--
Prin. 1-2/dist.	52	14%	21%	22%	31%	2%

Discussion

Evaluations of staff development projects support the use of individualized activities which are related to the different stages of a project and to the different developmental levels of individual teachers.

The data collected in this survey suggests one-third of Iowa's elementary principals allocate a "very small percentage" of their staff development funds

to individual teachers. For the other two-thirds, we know very little about the purposes for which the funds are spent.

- Are these funds used to support individual activities tied to institutional goals?
- Are the funds being spent on isolated or programmatic experiences?
- Since more funds are spent on individual teachers in smaller rural districts, is this due to the fact other options are not available?

The data only justifies tentative conclusions, but in combination with the types of staff development efforts teachers report receiving, it appears many elementary teachers in Iowa experience little or no individualized staff development assistance.

CHAPTER 5

PROVISIONS FOR EXPERIMENTATION AND FEEDBACK DURING STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Principle 5. Inservice education programs that emphasize demonstrations, supervised trials and feedback are more likely to accomplish their goals than are programs in which the teacher is expected to store up ideas and behavior prescriptions for a future time.

Introduction

Several sections in this report have already discussed the importance of using a variety of activities which place the teacher in an active role. Consistent with good learning theory, the most successful inservice programs use models, video or live demonstrations, and classroom embedded feedback (Callen, et al., 1983: 2).

As discussed earlier, change is multidimensional, involving changes in goals, skills, philosophy, materials, etc. If staff development is not approached in a thorough comprehensive manner, teachers may find their efforts toward change inadequate. There is a real cost involved when teachers are encouraged to change and then not given adequate support in their efforts to change. Dewey argued that no matter how laudable the cause, if you get people excited about new ideas and then don't help them do something with the ideas "you are doing something akin to immorality: 'If we get stirred up and do nothing about it, we next time have to increase the dose of being stirred up.'" (Tenenbaum, 1951: 174).

Providing teachers with instructional materials which model how an idea translates into practice is one type of support staff developers should provide. The materials help provide clarity and increase the chances the teacher will actually experiment with the idea in his/her classroom.

Slavin made this point in reviewing attempts to implement change relative to his work with cooperative learning strategies:

> . . . but any information-only kind of dissemination program is unlikely to make a significant change in educational practice. Our experience has been that a dissemination plan that is not targeted to getting training materials to teachers as directly as possible is not likely to succeed. (Slavin, 1981: 15-16)

Berman has also stressed the importance of providing materials:

> Training combined with the availability of materials is an important factor. Either half of the equation by itself is inadequate. Centers of economic education have traditionally recognized this. They base their programs on teacher training which includes developing materials that can be used in the teachers' classes. Similarly, D.E.E.P. committees usually plan for in-service training and either the development of materials or local adaptations of materials available through the D.E.E.P network. (Hahn and Rushing, 1981: 36-37)

During the sixties when the great revolution in curriculum was getting underway, Fenton spoke of the potential changes innovative instructional materials could produce:

> Perhaps the most effective way to change teaching strategies and objectives will be to change the starting place for most instruction, the materials for students. If this conclusion is valid, it justifies the enormous expenditure on new materials in the social studies curriculum projects. The new social studies will grow out of a revolution in materials. (Fenton, 1967: 60)

The failure of many curriculum innovations in the 60's and 70's can partially be attributed to the fact innovative instructional materials were developed but other aspects of staff development were not given sufficient emphasis.

Besides providing instructional materials and theoretical guidelines, the provision of live or videotaped models of the target behaviors will increase the likelihood teachers will successfully add the new technique to their repertoire. In a study of the comparative value of film or

video models, live models, written models and self-rating, Koran reached the following conclusions.

1. Film-mediated models are as effective as live models in accelerating the learning process.
2. Film-mediated models especially prepared for training and highlighting discrete behaviors, appear to be superior to self-modeling or viewing one's own performance.
3. Models which convey positive information regarding the skill are more effective than those conveying contrasting negative information.
4. As part of the initial training or supervision, the viewing of negative models may act as a change of pace, and may serve to clarify the nature of the skill to be acquired.
5. Models depicting both teacher-student behavior and student only behavior appear more effective than those depicting the teacher only behavior.

(Koran, 1972: 286)

Another key component to staff development is the provision of classroom embedded feedback. Teachers and teacher educators agree "there is a need for in-classroom follow up of inservice programs" (Yarger, Howey, and Joyce, 1977: 38). Hersh added some clarity to the importance of classroom embedded feedback at a conference when he responded to Jane Stallings' paper: "What Research Has to Say to Administrators of Secondary Schools About Effective Teaching and Staff Development". Hersh said:

> . . . if you teach teachers just theory (and Jane pointed out earlier that it is very important to teach theory, and that of course is joyful to teacher educators) that you might do pretty well in getting people to understand Kohlberg's theory of moral development, for example, but they won't be able to <u>do</u> it--they will not be able to demonstrate the skills. When you go in and measure new skills in actual classroom studies you find a five to ten percent transfer. So a theory-only presentation is not very powerful. If you add demonstration--a lot of video tape demonstrations, real life demonstration--you don't get much of a change. You get 10-15 percent transfer of skills. If you further add a lot of practice in peer-group teaching or micro-teaching in any sort of controlled setting where you can give people practice and feedback but it's still outside the classroom, you don't get much of an increase. But

> you get a giant jump when you combine these plus in class coaching, where someone is there providing additional feedback with real-time coaching over time--90 percent transfer. (Duckworth, et al., 1981: 48)

There are many fundamental reasons why classroom embedded feedback is so effective in bringing about change.

> From the transfer of learning literature we know that transfer is more likely when similarity exists between training tasks and transfer tasks (between the training environment and the workplace), a variety of training experiences is employed, skills are over-learned, and multiple opportunities for practice are provided (Ripple and Drinkwater 1982). While training settings partially can simulate these conditions, coaching of teachers in their classrooms greatly enhances and extends the possibility of meeting transfer of training criteria. Furthermore, by moving the training setting to the teacher's classroom, coaching acknowledges the new learning problem directly at the place transfer must occur.
>
> Coaching also provides the "continuous interaction between teachers and consultants" suggested by Fullan and Pomfret (1977) as a necessary condition for curriculum implementation that requires changes in teacher roles/behavior. Furthermore, the coach operates similarly to Hall's (1975, 1977) change agent in determining stages of concern regarding and levels of use of innovations, thus tailoring intervention to individual's states of readiness and need. (Showers, 1983: 15)

Classroom embedded feedback is extremely powerful; however, the value of providing exemplary instructional materials, live and/or video taped models and opportunities for roleplaying and microteaching should not be overlooked.

Research Review

Lawrence's review of research on inservice education produced several findings related to the use of models and classroom embedded feedback:

> Inservice programs most successful in accomplishing their objectives were ones that:
> - had opportunities for participants to see demonstrations of exemplary practices, and to learn the skills of observing the practices in themselves and others;
> - provided participants with relevant printed materials such as guidelines for learning and applying new skills;

> - had sequences in which participants could try out new things in their classrooms (or in simulations) and then receive appropriate feedback from a skilled person (programs in which participants were expected to store up new ideas and behavior prescriptions for a future time were distinctly less successful in achieving objectives). (Callen, et al., 1983: 2)

A summary of the evidence supporting the latter point is presented in Table 5.1.

TABLE 5.1
A COMPARISON OF PROGRAMS WHICH DO/DO NOT PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES FOR TRIAL AND FEEDBACK

	Trial and Feedback (N = 61)	Storing Up (N = 36)
Significant Positive Change	84%	55%
No Significant Difference	10%	31%
Mixed	6%	14%

(Source: Lawrence, G.D. "Patterns of Effective Inservice Education: A State of the Art Summary of Research on Materials and Procedures for Changing Teacher Behaviors in Inservice Education." Florida Educational Research and Development Program, Florida Department of Education, 1974: 16.)

The data in Table 5.1 delivers a strong message: staff development projects designed to change teacher behavior should provide some means for teachers to experiment with the ideas and receive feedback from knowledgeable observers. The value to teachers of receiving feedback on their efforts to use an innovation in their own classroom on a number of occasions has been confirmed by Showers in her 1983 study at The University of Oregon.

> The study confirmed that teachers can achieve skill in models of teaching that are new to them by studying theory, seeing it demonstrated a number of times, practicing, and getting feedback by knowledgeable persons. However, unless "coaching" is incorporated--that is, unless either teachers, administrators, or trainers visit the teachers in the classroom quite a number

of times following the training--little transfer of knowledge takes place. (Callen, et al., 1983: 2)

Survey of Practices in Iowa

Elementary principals and teachers in Iowa were asked how frequently they have been provided sample units and materials for classroom experimentation during staff development activities (see Figure 5).

Figure 5
FREQUENCY WITH WHICH SAMPLE UNITS
AND MATERIALS FOR CLASSROOM
EXPERIMENTATION ARE PROVIDED
QUESTION USED ON SURVEY INSTRUMENT

How often are you exposed to staff development activities where the presenters provide you with sample units and materials for classroom experimentation?

____ Almost always
____ Regularly
____ Sometimes
____ Seldom
____ Never

TABLE 5.2
FREQUENCY WITH WHICH SAMPLE UNITS
AND MATERIALS FOR CLASSROOM
EXPERIMENTATION ARE PROVIDED

SAMPLE	N	Almost Always	Regularly	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
Prin. 3-6 dist.	66	9%	8%	48%	32%	3%
Prin. 1-2 dist.	57	7%	12%	48%	32%	5%
Teachers	96	2%	9%	42%	32%	15%

The responses to this question, summarized in Table 5.2, indicate this is not a very common occurrance. (Note: It is possible such materials would not always be appropriate.)

When asked how frequently presenters provided written theoretical guidelines (see Figure 6), the responses were very similar.

Figure 6
FREQUENCY WITH WHICH WRITTEN
THEORETICAL GUIDELINES ARE PROVIDED
QUESTION USED ON SURVEY INSTRUMENT

How often are you exposed to staff development activities where the presenters provide you with written theoretical guidelines to better understand new ideas and techniques?

____ Almost always
____ Regularly
____ Sometimes
____ Seldom
____ Never

TABLE 5.3
FREQUENCY WITH WHICH WRITTEN
THEORETICAL GUIDELINES ARE PROVIDED

SAMPLE	N	Almost Always	Regularly	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
Prin. 3-6 dist.	64	8%	23%	42%	25%	2%
Prin. 1-2 dist.	56	2%	9%	57%	30%	2%
Teachers	96	9%	18%	41%	24%	8%

Besides written theoretical guidelines and the provision of sample instructional materials, models are important for purposes of clarity. Live and filmed demonstrations help translate theory into practice. The data in Table 5.4 indicate video or live demonstrations are fairly common. Only 13 percent of the teachers indicated they were "seldom" used.

Figure 7
USE OF LIVE OR VIDEOTAPED DEMONSTRATIONS
IN ELEMENTARY STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES
QUESTION USED ON SURVEY INSTRUMENT

How often are your teachers exposed to staff development activities which utilize demonstrations (video or live) giving teachers an opportunity to see actual examples?

____ Almost always
____ Over half the time
____ Less than half the time
____ Seldom
____ Never
____ I do not know

TABLE 5.4
USE OF LIVE OR VIDEOTAPED DEMONSTRATIONS
IN ELEMENTARY STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

SAMPLE	N	Almost Always	Over Half the Time	Less Than Half the Time	Seldom	Never
Prin. 3-6/dist.	66	6%	20%	35%	38%	1%
Prin. 1-2/dist.	57	--	22%	42%	34%	2%
Teachers	96	9%	32%	46%	13%	--

Another area of interest is the use of roleplaying and microteaching. The frequency with which Iowa's elementary principals and teachers report using these techniques was rather surprising given the cost and time factor involved in their use.

One possible explanation for the unexpected usage of microteaching and roleplaying is that over half the principals and superintendents who responded on the survey indicated their teachers were involved with

Figure 8
USE OF ROLEPLAYING AND MICROTEACHING
IN STAFF DEVELOPMENT
QUESTION USED ON SURVEY INSTRUMENT

In staff development, when new teaching techniques are presented, how often do you have the opportunity to practice the techniques in a controlled environment (roleplaying or microteaching) receiving feedback from consultants, supervisors, principals, or peers?

____ Almost always
____ Regularly
____ Sometimes
____ Seldom
____ Never

TABLE 5.5
USE OF ROLEPLAYING AND MICROTEACHING
IN STAFF DEVELOPMENT

SAMPLE	N	Almost Always	Regularly	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
Prin. 3-6/dist.	66	3%	13%	32%	38%	14%
Prin. 1-2/dist.	58	7%	24%	47%	22%	--
Teachers	96	1%	7%	26%	36%	30%

Madeline Hunter's inservice programs. Her staff development packages rely heavily on the use of videotaping.

In the area of classroom embedded feedback, almost one-third of the elementary teachers reported they never receive any. Another third said they "seldom" receive classroom embedded feedback.

To a lesser degree, but still worthy of note, principals also indicated a lack of classroom embedded feedback. Size of district was a factor, principals in smaller districts more frequently reported their teachers

Figure 9

FREQUENCY WITH WHICH ELEMENTARY TEACHERS
RECEIVE CLASSROOM EMBEDDED FEEDBACK ON
THEIR USE OF A NEW SKILL
QUESTION USED ON SURVEY INSTRUMENT

In staff development, when new teaching techniques are presented, how often do you have the opportunity to practice the techniques in your classroom and receive feedback specifically on your use of the new skill from consultants, supervisors, principals, or peers?

____ Almost always
____ Regularly
____ Sometimes
____ Seldom
____ Never

TABLE 5.6
FREQUENCY WITH WHICH ELEMENTARY TEACHERS
RECEIVE CLASSROOM EMBEDDED FEEDBACK ON
THEIR USE OF A NEW SKILL

SAMPLE	N	Almost Always	Regularly	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
Prin. 3-6/dist.	66	4%	24%	40%	28%	4%
Prin. 1-2/dist.	58	2%	14%	38%	36%	10%
Teachers	96	1%	11%	25%	33%	30%

"seldom" or "never" received classroom embedded feedback. Overall, only about 20 percent of the principals and 10 percent of the teachers indicated classroom embedded feedback was provided on a regular basis.

Important Facts

1. A total of 47 percent of the elementary teachers report they "seldom" or "never" receive sample units and materials for classroom experimentation during staff development sessions.

2. Only 2 percent of the elementary teachers said they "almost always" receive sample units and materials and only 9 percent said they receive them "regularly".
3. About one-third of the elementary teachers said they "seldom" or "never" receive written theoretical guidelines on new ideas and techniques during their staff development activities.
4. Only 9 percent of the elementary teachers said they "almost always" receive written theoretical guidelines and only 18 percent said they receive them "regularly".
5. Thirteen percent (13%) of the elementary teachers say they "seldom" see live or videotaped demonstrations of new teaching techniques. Forty-six percent (46%) say they see demonstrations "less than half the time". An encouraging 9 percent say demonstrations are used "almost always".
6. A total of 66 percent of the elementary teachers say they "seldom" or "never" have the opportunity to practice new techniques in a controlled environment (roleplaying or microteaching).
7. A total of 8 percent of the elementary teachers said they get to practice new techniques in a controlled environment "regularly" or "almost always".
8. A total of 63 percent of the elementary teachers report they "never" or "seldom" receive classroom embedded feedback on their use of new techniques and skills.
9. A total of 32 percent of the elementary principals from intermediate size districts (3-6 elem. prin./district) said teachers "seldom" or "never" receive classroom embedded feedback; whereas, 46 percent

of the elementary principals from smaller districts (1-2 principals/ district) reported this same lack of feedback for teachers.

10. A total of 28 percent of the principals from intermediate size districts and 16 percent of the principals from smaller districts said teachers "almost always" or "regularly" receive classroom embedded feedback. Only 12 percent of the elementary teachers said they "almost always" or "regularly" receive classroom embedded feedback.

Discussion

The value of giving teachers written theoretical guidelines, sample instructional activities for classroom experimentation, opportunities to practice new techniques in roleplaying or microteaching situations and on-going feedback on their efforts to use the new skill in their own classroom have been presented in this chapter. The elementary teachers' responses to the survey show that 32 percent of the teachers say they "seldom" or "never" receive theoretical guidelines; 57 percent say they "seldom" or "never" receive sample classroom materials; 66 percent say they "seldom or "never" have the opportunity for roleplaying or microteaching; and, a disappointing 63 percent say they never receive classroom embedded feedback. These numbers raise serious questions about the design of staff development activities being used in Iowa.

It is possible the percentages are misleading. Do the responses take into account the appropriateness of each of these items in light of the objectives and type of staff development being used? When principals and teachers reported the frequency with which they receive classroom embedded

feedback, were they thinking of the typical once a year observation used for summative evaluation purposes or were they thinking of "on-going" interaction typical of effective formative evaluation procedures?

If there are interpretation problems, chances are they affect the degree and not the general trends demonstrated by the data. One can conclude with a good degree of confidence that only a few of Iowa's elementary teachers in districts with less than 3,000 students are fortunate enough to work in settings where those responsible for staff development are aware of effective staff development guidelines and/or have the necessary resources (time, skill, district support) to help teachers improve and master new skills.

A particularly alarming finding is the fact 30 percent of the teachers said they "never" receive classroom embedded feedback, 33 percent said they "seldom" do, and 25 percent said they do "less than half the time". This means a total of 88 percent of the responding teachers report they do not regularly receive classroom embedded feedback. Of more concern is the possibility the type of feedback received is tied to summative and not formative evaluation procedures. This is an area where change is imperative. As noted by Brandt: "If inservice had less presenting and more practice, feedback, and coaching, teachers would have more professional skills--and probably more self-confidence" (Brandt, 1982: 3).

CHAPTER 6

PEER SUPPORT DURING STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Principle 6. Inservice education programs in which teachers share and provide mutual assistance to each other are more likely to accomplish their objectives than are programs in which each teacher does separate work.

Introduction

Learning a new skill often involves understanding and adopting new philosophical understandings. Fullan notes that these changes actually represent a process of resocialization. He stresses the importance of allowing each teacher to personally work through the arguments and doubts associated with any change process. Interaction with peers seems critical to this process. As stated by Fullan:

> Research on implementation has demonstrated beyond a shadow of a doubt that these processes of sustained interaction . . . are crucial regardless of what the change is concerned with. (Fullan, 1982:67)

Showers and Joyce have applied the label of coaching to this needed interaction:

> Coaching refers to the provision of a means for analyzing the teaching situation, determining the appropriateness of the use of the skill, the adaptations of it to learners having various characteristics, and the adjustment of the skill to a variety of teaching situations. (Joyce and Showers, 1981: 8)

In a later article, Joyce and Showers discussed some of the functions of coaching:

> The coaching relationship results in the possibility of mutual reflections, the checking of perceptions, the sharing of frustrations and success, and the informal thinking-through of mutual problems. Two people, watching each other try a new model of teaching for the first time, will find much to talk about. Companionship provides reassurance that problems are normal. Both persons find that their habitual

and automatic teaching patterns create awkwardness when they practice the new procedures. Concentrating on unfamiliar moves and ideas, they forget essential little odds and ends.

> Companionship not only makes the training process technically easier; it also makes the quality of the experience better. It is more pleasant to share a new practice than to do it in isolation. The lonely business of teaching has sorely lacked the companionship we envision for our coaching teams. Companionship also helps overcome the tendency to avoid practice during the "awkward" period. Practice must begin right after training. (Joyce and Showers, 1983: 20-21)

Other functions they described include:

- Provision of technical feedback

> Technical feedback should not be confused with general evaluation. Feedback implies no judgment about the overall quality of teaching but is confined to information about the execution of model-relevant skills. (Joyce and Showers, 1983: 21)

- Adaptation to the students

> One of the major functions of the coach is to help "players" to "read" the responses of the students to make decisions about skill training and how to adapt the model. This is especially important in the early stages of practice, when teachers are concerned with their own behavior and it is difficult to worry about the students as well. (Joyce and Showers, 1983: 22)

- Facilitation (overcoming the awkward stage)

> The successful use of a new teaching method requires practice. Early trials won't even be close to the normal standard of adequacy. Thus, a major job of the coaching team is to help its members feel good about themselves during these early trials. Teachers' lack of interpersonal support and close contact with others in the context of teaching is a tragedy. Coaching reduces this isolation and increases support. (Joyce and Showers, 1983: 22)

In most schools today, teachers seldom interact over substantive issues (Showers, 1983: 17). The team teaching movement probably came the closest

to providing an avenue for teachers to interact over curriculum and instructional concerns. In 1975, Gene Hall conducted an extensive study of team teaching. His findings spoke to the value of teacher-to-teacher interaction.

> Clearly, teachers who worked in a teaming context had the opportunity and were required to exchange teaching ideas. They also had the opportunity to observe other teachers and to plan and work together in various teaching tasks. This is a very powerful form of continuing inservice education. The particular configuration of teaming the teachers used was not important, but the opportunity for teachers to work and continually communicate with other teachers about teaching issues was important. Thus, an innovation that was created by its developers to help students was, in fact, of more help to teachers. (Callen, et al., 1983: 2)

Not all teachers want to team teach or would be effective in a team teaching situation, but a large study involving teachers in California, Michigan, and Georgia produced a report stating two-thirds of the teachers indicated "they would like more analysis of their teaching by other teachers" (Yarger, Howey, and Joyce, 1979: 16).

Research Review

Table 6.1 demonstrates the relative effectiveness of staff development projects in which teachers have the opportunity to share with each other as compared to working in isolation.

TABLE 6.1
A COMPARISON OF PROJECTS WHICH
PROVIDE FOR TEACHER SHARING VERSUS WORKING
IN ISOLATION

	Teachers Sharing (N=38)	Separate Work (N=59)
Significant Positive Change	84%	67%
No Significant Difference	8%	23%
Mixed	8%	10%

(Source: Lawrence, G.D. "Patterns of Effective Inservice Education: A State of the Art Summary of Research on Materials and Procedures for Changing Teacher Behaviors in Inservice Education." Florida Educational Research and Development Program, Florida Department of Education, 1974: 16.)

Survey of Practices in Iowa

Avenues for teacher-to-teacher interaction and opportunities for counsel with administrators or consultants are both lacking in Iowa's elementary schools as reported by teachers and principals.

Sixty percent (60%) of the elementary teachers report that structured avenues are "seldom" or "never" provided for mutual support in their staff development activities (see Table 6.2). Principal reactions are similar. Twelve percent (12%) of the teachers and 14 to 21 percent of the principals noted a support network was regularly provided.

In terms of providing mutual assistance, district size was not a significant factor. In Iowa's elementary schools, few structured avenues are provided to encourage teacher-to-teacher support when innovations are introduced.

Figure 10
STRUCTURED OPPORTUNITIES FOR TEACHERS TO SHARE
WITH EACH OTHER AND PROVIDE MUTUAL ASSISTANCE
QUESTION USED ON SURVEY INSTRUMENT

In staff development, when new teaching techniques are presented, how often is a structured avenue provided for you to share and provide mutual assistance to other teachers as you try to use the new technique in your classroom?

____ Almost always
____ Regularly
____ Sometimes
____ Seldom
____ Never

TABLE 6
STRUCTURED OPPORTUNITIES FOR TEACHERS TO SHARE
WITH EACH OTHER AND PROVIDE MUTUAL ASSISTANCE

SAMPLE	N	Almost Always	Regularly	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
Prin. 3-6/dist.	66	3%	18%	41%	35%	3%
Prin. 1-2/dist.	57	--	14%	46%	28%	12%
Teachers	96	2%	10%	28%	32%	28%

A similar sad state of affairs is evident when it comes to opportunities for elementary teachers to interact with principals, supervisors, and/or consultants as teachers try to integrate a new technique into their daily instructional setting.

Providing counsel to help a teacher refine and integrate an innovation into their instructional program has been shown to be important to

Figure 11
PROVIDING COUNSEL TO HELP A TEACHER INTEGRATE
AN INNOVATION INTO THEIR INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM
QUESTION USED ON SURVEY INSTRUMENT

After initial implementation, how often are avenues provided which allow you to talk with consultants, supervisors, or principals to make refinements and integrate an innovation into your instructional program?

____ Almost always
____ Regularly
____ Sometimes
____ Seldom
____ Never

TABLE 6.3
PROVIDING COUNSEL TO HELP A TEACHER INTEGRATE
AN INNOVATION INTO THEIR INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

SAMPLE	N	Almost Always	Regularly	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
Prin. 3-6/dist.	67	12%	30%	36%	21%	1%
Prin. 1-2/dist.	57	5%	29%	45%	21%	--
Teachers	96	4%	9%	34%	35%	18%

successful implementation and maintenance of an innovation. In Iowa, approximately 40 percent of the elementary principals say this happens "sometimes" and 21 percent say it happens "seldom" (see Table 6.3). The elementary teachers report it happens less frequently--35 percent say this type of counsel "seldom" occurs and 18 percent of the teachers say it "never" occurs.

Important Facts

1. A total of 60 percent of the elementary teachers report they "seldom" or "never" have a structured avenue provided for teacher-to-teacher interaction and support when they are trying to use a new technique in their classroom. This same state of affairs is indicated by approximately 40 percent of the elementary principals sampled.
2. Only a total of 12 percent of the elementary teachers and roughly 15-20 percent of the elementary principals say teachers "regularly" or "almost always" have a structured avenue provided for interaction and mutual assistance.
3. Over half the elementary teachers and approximately 20 percent of the elementary principals report teachers "seldom" or "never" are provided avenues to interact with consultants, supervisors, or principals as they try to integrate an innovation into their instructional program.
4. Only 13 percent of the elementary teachers and roughly 35 to 45 percent of the elementary principals report teachers "regularly" or "almost always" have access to this expert counsel to help them integrate a new technique into their repertoire.

Discussion

Besides receiving feedback on initial attempts to use a new technique or innovation, teachers benefit from the opportunity to discuss and provide mutual support to other teachers trying to implement the same technique. After teachers have mastered the mechanical and procedural operations of an innovation, they begin to have more philosophical and interpretive questions.

During this phase of the process of change, teachers benefit from interaction where they can discuss the use of an innovation with peers or with consultants, supervisors, or administrators. Avenues for both a teacher support network and expert counsel seem to be infrequent in staff development activities experienced by Iowa's elementary teachers. This is a serious omission. Without these support systems, many teachers will shy away from continued attempts to try an innovation; others will only succeed in a rather mechanical routine manner. They will not internalize and, thus, capitalize on the full potential of the innovation.

Change is a process. Staff development efforts need to be multidimensional. Just as motivational and awareness sessions play an important role, so do avenues which provide for teacher-to-teacher interaction and the availability of on-going expert counsel. To a great extent, these opportunities appear to be missing in the staff development activities provided Iowa's elementary teachers.

SUMMARY

> At its worst, in-service training is a gigantic spectator sport for teachers costing at least twenty million dollars annually.
>
> Flanders, 1967

The above quote is almost twenty years old, yet it comes close to describing the state of affairs in many of Iowa's elementary schools. Responses to a questionnaire on staff development from approximately 100 elementary teachers randomly selected from Iowa's elementary schools produced the following dismal results:

- 50 percent report "almost all" their staff development activities are "single-shot" sessions.
- 47 percent report "almost all" their staff development activities use a lecture format placing them in a receptive role. Only 26 percent say this happens "less than half the time".
- 52 percent say they "seldom" or "never" are involved in initiating or planning staff development activities. Only 11 percent say they "regularly" or "almost always" are involved.
- 47 percent say they "seldom" or "never" receive sample instructional materials during staff development activities. Only 11 percent say this happens "regularly".
- 32 percent say they "seldom" or "never" receive written theoretical guidelines. Only 18 percent say this happens "regularly"; 9 percent say "almost always".
- 63 percent (an alarmingly high percentage) say they "seldom" or "never" receive classroom embedded feedback on their use of new

techniques. Only 11 percent say this happens "regularly"; 1 percent say "almost always".

- 60 percent say they "seldom" or "never" have a structured avenue for teacher-to-teacher interaction and support when they are trying to use a new technique in their classroom. Only 10 percent say this happens "regularly"; 2 percent say "almost always".
- 53 percent say they "seldom" or "never" are provided opportunities for interaction with consultants, supervisors, or principals when they are trying to integrate a new innovation into their instructional program. Only 9 percent say this happens "regularly"; 4 percent say "almost always".

It is reasonable to conclude from these percentages that much of the funds allocated to staff development are being spent ineffectively. This is not peculiar to Iowa. Similar findings have been noted in other states. The quote below is from a study of inservice in California, Michigan, and Georgia.

> The message is both loud and clear: inservice teacher education is not in the best of health. Data collected in this survey clearly indicates that this perception is shared by all concerned with the endeavor: teachers, professors, and taxpayers. Additionally, data collected in the interviews that served as a partial basis for this study supports the notion that bureaucrats, policy makers, and administrators feel quite the same way. (Yarger, Howey, and Joyce, 1979: 41)

About 20 years ago, the same year Flanders called inservice education a costly spectator sport, Taba listed three essentials for effective staff development.

> However, it was evident that even ten days can make an immediate impact on the methods of teaching, provided that such training fulfills at least three conditions:
>
> 1. Gives a reasonable theoretical foundation for the strategy in terms that teachers can understand.

2. Provides models
3. Gives opportunities to mobilize self-learning by providing feedback on their own attempts at these strategies.

(Taba, 1967: 63)

Several other critical components have been added in the last 20 years.

> In order to learn new strategies, teachers need to study the theory underlying strategies, to see demonstrations, to have opportunities for practicing with careful feedback, and finally, to receive coaching on-site. (Joyce, 1980: 18)

These recommendations have a solid research base. They should not be taken lightly. Both direct and indirect costs result from poorly designed staff development efforts.

The most obvious direct cost is the lack of change. As noted by Showers, "--little of the considerable resources expended on educational change results in lasting efforts in the ways schools address their educational tasks" (Showers, 1983: 1).

Besides the lack of change, there are indirect costs resulting from poorly designed staff development efforts:

- Cynicism is a product of poorly designed staff development activities. If teachers experience inservice education which is not helpful, then they develop negative attitudes. "Thus, well-planned and effective inservice education has to struggle against the reputation of its predecessors" (Joyce: 1980: 17).

  As stated by Fullan:

  > The importance of the district's history of innovation attempts can be stated in the form of a proposition: the more the teachers or others have had negative experiences with previous implementation attempts in the district or elsewhere, the more cynical or apathetic they will be about the next change presented regardless of the merit of the new idea or program (see Sarason, 1971, pp. 219-22). (Fullan, 1982: 63)

- Anxiety results from the lack of feedback and the lack of teacher-to-teacher interaction:

> Because teachers do not usually see others work, they are, for the most part, unsure about the quality of their performance. They don't know what they do well, or what they do poorly. The average teacher does some things easily with considerable skill, while other tasks require considerable labor. If faculty members could watch each other, they would have some idea of where they stand. They would also know what they could learn from each other. Furthermore, not knowing who you are or where you stand makes it difficult to have an adequate, realistic professional self-concept. Some people who are very good at some tasks are uncertain and insecure; others who are rather awkward in many dimensions of teaching think they are relatively skillful. Considerable anxiety is generated by privatism, and the loss in terms of possible learning from one another is very great. (Joyce, 1980: 17)

Besides the data collected from elementary teachers, responses were also collected from approximately 130 elementary principals and 115 superintendents. The principals were randomly selected from districts having less than 3,000 students and their responses were analyzed in two subgroups: principals from districts have one or two elementary principals and districts having three to six elementary principals. Feedback from principals was similar in direction to that of teachers; district size was a significant variable.

- 57 percent of the principals from the intermediate size districts (3-6 prin/dist) reported "over half" or "almost all" of the staff development activities were "single-shot" sessions; whereas, 76 percent of the principals from small districts (1-2 prin/dist) did the same.

- 38 percent of the principals from intermediate sized districts reported teachers were "seldom" or "never" involved in initiating and organizing staff development activities; whereas, 50 percent of the principals from the smaller districts did the same.
- 32 percent of the principals from intermediate sized districts reported teachers "seldom" or "never" received classroom embedded feedback on their use of a new skill; whereas, 46 percent of the principals from smaller districts did the same.

There was overlap between the questionnaires sent to superintendents and those sent to principals on one of the above items:

- 25 percent of the superintendents (N=16) from Iowa's largest districts (over 3,000 students enrolled) indicated "over half" or "almost all" of their staff development activities were "single shot" sessions; 62 percent of the superintendents (N=69) from districts (less than 3,000 students) indicated the same.

Concern has to be raised by the fact that district size is a significant variable in the above cases: Why do smaller districts rely more heavily on reportedly less effective practices? Is there a qualitative difference in the knowledge and skill of the personnel in charge of designing staff development activities? Is it due to poorly developed infrastructures of communication (as suggested in Chapter 1)? Is it a product of tradition and resistance to change? Why do smaller districts appear to have less effective staff development programs?

The majority of teachers who will be teaching in Iowa's schools in the year 2000 are teaching in Iowa's schools today. If these teachers are going to integrate new technologies and new curricular ideas, if these teachers

are going to learn new techniques and strategies, and if these teachers are going to meet the challenge of A Nation at Risk, changes are needed in the design and implementation of staff development activities.

Recommendations

1. The State should append Section 280.12 of the Iowa Code to require districts to develop and maintain multi-dimensional staff development programs. (Note: This does not mean the State should dictate either the amount or type of inservice--see Fullan, 1982: Chapter 12).
2. The State should provide incentives to schools and/or districts to develop more effective staff development programs, programs which reflect the knowledge base currently available.
3. A comprehensive program should be made available to the State's local administrators and inservice committees to help them design and implement more effective staff development programs. Such an effort should be consistent in design with the guidelines discussed in this paper (i.e., long term, multi-dimensional, providing for peer support and peer interaction, etc.).
4. An analysis should be made of services, procedures, and linkages between and among D.P.I., A.E.A., and local staff to identify areas of concern and possible suggestions for improvement.
5. A more in-depth analysis should be made of factors influencing or creating the seemingly less effective staff development activities being provided to or by Iowa's smaller districts.

The State needs to exercise leadership by mandating, by providing technical assistance, by coordinating professional networks, and by offering incentives and/or redirecting staff development funds to improve current staff development practices in Iowa.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Callon, M.F., Gene E. Hall, Bruce Joyce, Gordon Lawrence, and Donald Orlich. "Inservice Education," Practical Applications of Research, Newsletter of Phi Delta Kappa's Center on Evaluation, Development, and Research, Vol. 5 No. 3, March 1983.

Brandt, Ron. "Overview," Educational Leadership, p. 3, October 1982.

Daresh, John C. and James C. LaPlant. "In-service for School Principals: a Status Report," The Executive Review, Institute for School Executives, The University of Iowa, Vol. 3 No. 7, April 1983.

Duckworth, Kenneth, Ellen Kehoe, Wynn DeBevoise, and Faith Donovan (eds.). Creating Conditions for Effective Teaching, (Proceedings of a Conference held on July 17-18, 1981 at the Center for Education Policy and Management, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403, 1981.

Dumais, M.D., G. Eade, D. Fromberg, C.J. Gorman, J.E. Mook, M. Szymanski, K. Townsend, and J. Winsand. "Investigating Inservice," a monograph distributed by the Association of Teacher Educators, 1982.

Fenton, Edwin. The New Social Studies, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967.

Flanders, Ned. "Teacher Behavior and In-Service Programs," Interaction Analysis: Theory, Research and Application, edited by Edmund J. Amidon and John B. Hough, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1967.

Fullan, Michael. The Meaning of Educational Change, Teachers College Press, 1982.

Glatthorn, Allan A. Differentiated Supervision, a monograph distributed by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1984.

Goodland, John. Dynamics of Educational Change, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Hahn, Carole L. and Francis W. Rushing. Economic Education: Links to the Social Studies, Prentice Hall, 1981.

Hall, Gene E., Susan J. Loucks, William L. Rutherford, and Beulah W. Newlove. "Levels of Use of the Innovation: A Framework for Analyzing Innovation Adoption." Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. 26, No. 1, pp. 52-56, Spring 1975.

House, E. The Politics of Educational Innovation, Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan, 1974.

Joyce, Bruce. "The Continuous Process of School Improvement: Lessons Learned from the Past," a monograph distributed by the Association of Teacher Educators, 1980.

Joyce, Bruce R. and Beverly Showers. "Teacher Training Research: Working Hypotheses for Program Design and Directions for Further Study," a paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association, Los Angeles, 1981.

Joyce, Bruce and Beverly Showers. "The Coaching of Teaching," Educational Leadership, pp. 20-24, January 1983.

Koran, J.J. Jr. "The Use of Modeling, Feedback, and Practice Variables to Influence Science Teacher Behavior," Science Education, Vol. 56, No. 3, pp. 285-291, 1972.

Lawrence, G., D. Baker, B. Hansen, and P. Elzie. "Patterns of Effective Inservice Education: A State of the Art Summary of Research on Materials and Procedures for Changing Teacher Behaviors in Inservice Education." Florida Educational Research and Development Program, Florida Dept. of Education, 1974.

Leithwood, K.A. and D.J. Montgomery. "The Role of the Elementary School Principal in Program Improvement," Review of Educational Research, Vol. 52 No. 3, pp. 309-339, Fall 1982.

Mangieri, John N. and Richard E. Kemper. "Administrators: The Keys to Successful Inservice Programs," NASSP Bulletin, pp. 27-31, March 1983.

Ripple, R.E. and D.J. Drinkwater. "Transfer of Learning," in H.E. Mitzel (Ed.) Encyclopedia of Educational Research, Vol. 4. New York: The Free Press, Macmillan Publishing Co., 1982.

Rogus, Joseph F. "Building an Effective Staff Development Program: A Principal's Checklist," NASSP Bulletin, pp. 9-16, March 1983.

Sarason, S. The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

Showers, Beverly. "Coaching: A Training Component for Facilitating Transfer of Training," paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association in Montreal, Canada, April 11-15, 1983.

Slavin, Robert F. "A Case Study of Psychological Research Affecting Classroom Practice: Student Team Learning." The Elementary School Journal, Vol. 82, No. 1, pp. 5-17, September, 1981.

Stallings, Jane. "What Research Has to Say to Administrators of Secondary Schools about Effective Teaching and Staff Development," Creating Conditions for Effective Teaching edited by Duckworth, et. al. Proceedings of a Conference Held on July 17-18, 1981, at the Center for Education Policy and Management, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403, 1981.

Sweeney, Richard L. "A Status Report of In-Service Education in Area Education Agencies," Instructional/Professional Development, I.S.E.A., 1983.

Taba, Hilda. "Teaching Strategies and Cognitive Functioning in Elementary School Children," Cooperative Research Project No. 2404, San Francisco State College, Feb. 1966.

Tenenbaum, Samuel. William Heard Kilpatrick, New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1951.

Wood, F.H. and S.R. Thompson. "Guidelines for Better Staff Development," Educational Leadership, Vol. 37, pp. 374-376, 1980.

Wood, Fred H., Steven R. Thompson, and Sister Francis Russell. "Designing Effective Staff Development Programs," Staff Development/Organization Development, the 1981 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, pp. 59-91, 1981.

Yarger, Sam J., Kenneth R. Howey, and Bruce R. Joyce. Inservice Teacher Education, Booksend Laboratory, Palo Alto, Cal., 1979.

Other available publications.

LEAG SERIES, 1983

83-1. Childcare Consumers: Assessing Information Needs of Iowa's Parents. D. Pinsky and R. Fuqua, January 1984, 76 pp.--$4

83-2 Job Training in Iowa. N. Zamastil, February 1984, 60 pp.--$4

83-3 State Policies to Facilitate the Financing of Infrastructure in Iowa. P. Fisher, February 1984, 117 pp.--$5

83-4 Government and Employer Roles in Child Care Policy. L. Osbun and A. Maney, January 1984, 114 pp.--$5

83-5 Municipal Services, Economic Revitalization, and Small Cities in an Era of Retrenchment: An Analysis of Small Iowa Cities. G. Mattson, March 1984, 178 pp.--$7

83-6 Impact Analysis of a Cost-Based Approach to Highway Financing in Iowa. D. Forkenbrock, March 1984, 75 pp.--$4

83-7 An Analysis of Staff Development Activities Conducted in Iowa's Public Elementary Schools. R. Shepardson, June 1984, 60 pp.--$4